



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by sympathy and co-operation and the spirit of kindness; expanding the theory of personal ethics into the theory of national and international ethics, nay, more, showing that any system of ethics which does not include the larger view is only half ethical, that "righteousness and good will apply to nations as well as to individuals"; aiding in the development not only of an "international mind," but also of an international conscience, an international heart, and an international soul.

"Happy are thou, O Israel!" might well be applied to this people in its leadership today. An idealist for our President? Yes, fortunately—for where there is no vision the people perish—but also a leader whose platform of peace by every possible means is the only practical one for a civilized age. The issue is clean-cut. Shall the slogan of this country be "Might is Right" or "Right is Might"? The world is having a tragic object-lesson as to the working out of the first. Does it appeal to thinking men and women as a success? a step onward in civilization? a progress from any point of view, material, moral, spiritual? Is the world a better, happier, more useful, more beautiful place today because of the practical application of that theory? Shall we follow blindly in the wake of a theory that would make brute force the dominant power in the world? War as a method of settling international disputes is a looking backward. Modern science, modern business, modern enterprise in its multifiform expressions are not content to look backward. War is an anachronism in this age, when all the forces of civilization, improved methods of transportation and communication, common interests of business, education, philanthropy, social bet-

terment are combining to draw the nations of the world together.

Granted that it is difficult in this time of strain and stress to find a way out, there are few things worth accomplishing that are not difficult, and the very difficulty should serve as a spur, not as a deterrent. We have been told today by a business man that business men do not stop in the promotion of big business because there are difficulties in the way. Surely this is big business—the biggest business that civilization has ever had before it—and the solution of the problem is a challenge to every thinking man and woman.

I do not need to remind this audience of some of the practical measures possible—a future world peace league; as a present measure, non-intercourse, diplomatic and commercial, with a recalcitrant power; the utilization of the coming Pan-American Congress for concerted action on the part of neutral nations, and an effort to support and help, by every possible means, the womanhood of the civilized world, the women of the warring as well as the neutral nations, who, in the midst of their heart-rending calamity, have shown a solidarity in their protest against war never before experienced in the history of the world.

There are psychological moments in the life of nations as in the life of individuals, and the United States is facing such a moment not only as to its action in the present crisis, but also as to its policy for the future. Shall we follow in the footsteps of the theory responsible for a calamity unparalleled in history, or strive to realize the ideal of a "powerful nation really Christian in its international relations"?

JOINING THE ISSUE

Controversy over a fact, affirmed by one side and denied by another, is known in law as an "issue." Taking up the two sides respectively is called "joining the issue." A great need of the peace movement in the argument with its opponents is first to "join the issue." The following self-explanatory letter, with a summary of replies already received, is printed with the hope that many of our readers will be stirred to add their wisdom to this process of "joining the issue." Any intelligent contribution to the problem, if not too long, will be welcomed.

THE EDITOR.

Mr. A. N. Y. Militarist.

DEAR SIR: I have read with great interest your statement, in which you say: "The peace prattlers are in no way blessed. On the contrary, only mischief has sprung from the activities of the professional peace prattlers, the ultra-pacifists, who, with the shrill clamor of eunuchs, preach the gospel of the milk and water of virtue, and scream that belief in the efficacy of diluted moral mush is essential to salvation."

Now, Mr. Militarist, I wonder whom you have in mind when you express such sentiments? I cannot believe that you refer to the "professional pacifists" whom I know, the men who have been chosen to represent the organized peace movement of America, those of the American Peace Society, for example, the society which has heretofore constituted about all there has been to the organized peace movement in America since its beginnings in 1815.

You will probably agree that there are self-reliant persons overanxious to parade their masculine views by laughing scornfully at us "pacifists." You will probably agree that if one calls another "spineless," "effeminate," "unpatriotic," and "dangerous," with sufficient emphasis, one gets rather cheaply the reputation in some quarters of having a manly vigor of intellect, of being virile, masculine, patriotic, and statesmanlike.

Of course I would not intimate that your motives could be of such. You are not concerned surely in promoting simply your own reputation. You are interested in promoting the cause of international peace. I note with pleasure that you intimate just this. To be sure, you insist that the peace must be a "peace of righteousness"; but there is no difference of opinion between us on that score.

You must be acquainted with the history of the organized peace movement in America. You must know that it does not advocate disarmament for our country, or any other wild scheme. You must know that our main assumption is, and always has been, simply that war as a means of settling international disputes represents a dying civilization and a civilization that ought to be dead—that war is a relic of a barbaric age, an insane, futile, and intolerable nuisance. You will probably agree with us that war must, therefore, pass away as has the code duello, piracy, the thumbkin, the screw, and the rack, and that this process should be hastened with all possible dispatch.

You must be aware that the organized peace movement has consistently maintained that the hideous means of settling international disputes by war can be abolished only by supplanting it with a better and more rational method; in short, that we have always stood, and still stand, for the principle that there must be a substitute for this international murder. Indeed, at the first annual meeting of the American Peace Society in 1829 it was pointed out that there must be a "Congress of Nations." It was in the year 1840 that the founder of this society, William Ladd, published his historic essay entitled "A Congress of Nations." Of course you have read this essay. You know that it sets forth masterfully the need not only for a Congress of Nations, but a High Court of Nations as well; in other words, that human intelligence must devise an international legislature and an international judiciary. No one knows better than you that out of these teachings these two departments have already been launched, so far as human collective judgment and effort have been able to accomplish them thus far; that they have functioned in practical ways, and that they are going to be perfected increasingly.

Prior to July last we had had practically six hundred international agreements, no one of which had ever required the force of arms. We then had the faith, therefore, that an international executive other than that of public opinion was not necessary. Today we are still inclined to oppose the proposal for such an executive, in the form of an international police, for reasons appearing elsewhere in these pages.

Therefore, sir, you could not have meant the American Peace Society when you wrote as quoted. Surely you do not believe us to be a "dangerous people," on the ground that we are a supine peace-at-any-price organization. We claim that we, like yourself, are patriots, serving our country better because we love humanity more. Indeed, we insist that the greatest need of our world is the extension of the very principles for which we have stood so long. All self-respecting persons of our country, therefore, must somehow be led to disabuse their minds of their silly misinterpretations, to resolve at last to think together in international terms, to join the international peace movement, and to do their share towards shaking off this monstrous curse.

The world was never more in need of right thinking and high behavior on the plane of humanity than now. Surely you and the rest of us must agree to this. In God's name, may we not therefore together subscribe to this altogether righteous movement in behalf of international justice, without which we are in a sad case indeed? The time is now upon us when we workers for world peace should cease "fighting" among ourselves. What is most needed is co-operation, self-sacrifice, and light. Therefore I would that your caustic criticisms could be applied definitely and specifically to those who deserve them; for it seems unnecessary, unwarranted, and, may I say, unjust, that by suggestion and innuendo they should be left hanging to no one in particular, but to all of us in general, to hamper us in the work which we are struggling as best we can to accomplish.

Believe me, sir,

Yours very respectfully,

ARTHUR D. CALL.

REPLIES

Among the "personal" replies already received to this letter we are able to summarize the following points:

"You, your President, and other members have not supported by voice and, where they had the power, by vote the policy of fortifying the Panama Canal. You have therefore offended against righteousness."

"You and your associates are not at this moment backing up the effort to give us a much larger army, to secure universal military training of an effective kind for our young men on a thoroughly democratic basis, and to bring our navy up to the highest point of perfection."

"Your society and your associates individually did not cordially support the war sixteen years ago when we freed Cuba. Peace had been kept for a number of years, while Cuba was trodden under heel by tyranny. By the sacrifice of a couple of hundred men we brought peace to the island and prosperity such as it had never known. This was a real victory for peace; and we conferred the same benefits upon the Philippines."

"You clearly lump all wars together, righteous and unrighteous alike. You seem to class the war fought under Washington for American Independence and under Lincoln for the union of this nation and the freedom of the slave in the same category with the wars of Attila and Genghis Khan. You seem to classify the use of the knife by a great surgeon to save life with the use of the knife by Apaches. You seem to classify young Shaw and young Lowell, in the Civil War, and the men of Bunker Hill and the stormers of Stony Point, in the Revolution, as in the same category with the men who used the thumbscrew and the rack."

"Your reference to six hundred peace agreements is not of the slightest consequence. The worth of a promise lies in the keeping of it. You have not specifically denounced President Wilson and Secretary Bryan for failing to uphold The Hague conventions to which this country attached its signature, when, in defiance of them, Belgium was trodden under foot. In this respect you have been derelict in your duty and are derelict now."

"It is not of the slightest use to praise peace in the abstract if you are afraid to stand up effectively for peace—of course, the peace of righteousness, for any other kind of peace is abhorrent—in the concrete."

"We all believe in peace; but some of us believe in the peace of justice, and not in the peace that consecrates the misdeeds of successful violence."

"An ounce of performance is worth a ton of windy declamation about wrong in the abstract; above all, when there is failure to take any steps against wrong in the concrete. You have not denounced Messrs. Wilson and Bryan for the ridiculous arbitration or commission treaties that they have been passing by the score, at the same time that, with timid obsequiousness to wrongdoing, they have failed to protest against Belgium. Therefore you have no right to say that you are for peace."

"It is idle to talk about the peace of righteousness as a world proposition until we definitely make up our minds as a nation that we will not make any promises which cannot and ought not to be kept and will not be

kept, and that we will prepare ourselves in thorough-going military fashion so as to make our words of weight."

"Without questioning your sincerity, the net effect of your teachings for ten years has been to produce that dreadful flabbiness of moral fiber which subordinates righteousness to peace."

"Your movement does more damage to the nation than all the crookedness in business and politics combined. It is serving the devil and not the Lord."

"A movement such as yours invariably strengthens the cause of brutality and cruelty in nations which still

retain virility. Peace at any price in China excites to action the war parties of both Russia and Japan at the expense of China."

"The Woman's Peace Party has for the last few months given what little strength it could to the unrighteous exponents of aggressive militarism in Europe, and has brought sickness of heart to the wretched sufferers in France and Belgium, and has done its feeble best to add to the danger of American women and children on the high seas, and to suffer wrong-doers against women and children in France and Belgium to go unpunished."

BRIEF PEACE NOTES

THE Victories of Peace will be the general theme of the Southern Commercial Congress which will hold its seventh annual convention at Charleston, S. C., December 13 to 17. A survey will be made of the achievements of the South during the last fifty years. The changing relations between the North and the South will also be interpreted.

... Student meetings to be held in San Francisco in August are the western section of the Chinese Students' Alliance, August 2 to 5; the International Hindustani Students' Convention, August 14 to 16, and the Asiatic Students' Alliance, August 23 to 24. Conferences on International Polity will also be held at the University of California during the week of August 30 and at Leland Stanford Junior University the week of September 6.

... Students from many nations will attend the International Students' Reunion to be given in San Francisco under the auspices of the Association of Cosmopolitan Clubs from August 16 to 21. Several eminent speakers of various nations have been secured to deliver addresses. Problems of international scope will be discussed, some of the topics being "Responsibility of Students for the World's Peace," "Students' Opportunity in Social Reconstruction after the European War," "Contributions of the Orient to Civilization," and "Future Relations of the Nations of the Western Hemisphere."

... According to a statement recently issued by the Church Peace Union, 95 per cent of the clergymen of the United States are opposed to any increase in this country's military forces. A poll of 10,000 clergymen was taken by the union. The following question was asked: "Do you approve of the agitation for increasing armaments now being conducted by various organizations, or do you agree with President Wilson that any agitation of 'America's unpreparedness for war' is unfortunate at just this stage?" For the last part of the question most of the answers were in the affirmative.

... Two student conferences dealing with international relations have recently been held in England. "International Relationships in the Light of Christianity" was the subject under discussion at the fourth annual meeting of the United Summer School at Swanwick, England. The school was held from June 26 to July 5, under the auspices of the Interdenominational Confer-

ence of Social Service Unions. The underlying forces which control the destinies of men and nations and produce the states of war and peace were considered at a conference on the "Pacifist Philosophy of Life" in London, July 8 and 9.

... M. Henri La Fontaine, the Belgian Senator and the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, has recently asked:

"Can a reasonable end be foreseen to these Homeric combats; to these holocausts without name and without glory; to this negation of all the civilization acquired at the cost of centuries of effort; to this scientific return to the barbarism of primitive times? That is the question I put to the military experts. Will they deign to answer? The world is anxiously waiting to know whether this horrible massacre must lead Europe to suicide or not, or whether the militarists, to the detriment of the foolish peoples, desire to enjoy the Satanic pleasure of proving by blood and fire that it is war that has become a Utopia."

... In accordance with the provisions of the treaties providing for international commissions of inquiry, the following have been appointed as United States commissioners: A. R. Talbot, of Nebraska, Bolivia; James B. McCreary, of Kentucky, Costa Rica; Judson Harmon, of Ohio, Denmark; Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, France; George Gray, of Delaware, Great Britain; William J. Stone, of Missouri, Guatemala; George L. MacKintosh, of Indiana, Italy; James Brown Scott, of the District of Columbia, Norway; W. S. Jennings, of Florida, Paraguay; Eugene Wambaugh, of Massachusetts, Peru; James M. Cox, of Ohio, Portugal; Edwin A. Alderman, of Virginia, and Charles R. Crane, of New York, Russia; Cyrus Northrup, of Minnesota, Spain; Samuel Avery, of Nebraska, Sweden; Harry B. Hutchins, of Michigan, Uruguay.

... Notwithstanding the war, the German Socialist Party has recently declared that "the people want no conquest of land; they want peace." The declaration is set forth in a manifesto under date of June 26, appearing as a full-page advertisement in the *Vorwaerts* of Berlin. Not until the paper had crossed the German frontiers was the full importance of the pronouncement realized. The last paragraph of the manifesto reads:

"If the war is not to go on indefinitely until all the nations are completely exhausted, some one of the powers